

**MINUTES OF THE
AUBURN CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
FEBRUARY 18, 2003**

The regular session of the Auburn City Planning Commission was called to order on February 18, 2003 at 6:30 p.m. by Chairman Nesbitt in the Council Chambers, 1225 Lincoln Way, Auburn, California.

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Hale, Manning, McCord, Smith, Chrm. Nesbitt

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT: None

STAFF PRESENT: Will Wong, Community Development; Reg Murray, Associate Planner; Tom Fossum, Public Works Director; Janet Ferro, Administrative Assistant

ITEM I: CALL TO ORDER

ITEM II: PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

ITEM III: APPROVAL OF MINUTES

None.

ITEM IV: PUBLIC COMMENT

None.

ITEM V: PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS

- A. General Plan Amendment, Rezone, and Development Agreement – 11025 Blocker Drive (Blocker Rezone) – File #s GPA 02-1, RE 02-1, DA 03-1.** The applicant requests approval of a General Plan Amendment and a Rezone to change the land use and zoning designations from Single-family Residential to Commercial/Industrial and Commercial/Light Manufacturing, respectively. A Development Agreement is also requested which

identifies specific uses and design standards that will apply to 11025 Blocker Drive.

Associate Planner Reg Murray gave the staff report. He reviewed the list of allowable uses that was arrived at by staff in working with the developer and a resident of the nearby residential subdivision. He also reviewed the Development Agreement requested and noted that staff is in support of this application.

The public hearing was opened.

Ruby Nogy, Hidden Creek Subdivision resident, stated concerns with the office and light industrial zoning being allowed in this proposal. She felt that there is currently too much traffic on this street along with inadequate parking, and this rezone would only exacerbate the existing problems.

Michael Reilly, president of the Hidden Creek Homeowner's Association, asked that the current zoning be retained and this proposal be denied.

James Maneggie, Hidden Creek resident, also outlined existing traffic and parking concerns that he feels will increase with allowing commercial development in the area. He also noted concerns with the creek that runs through the area.

Planner Murray pointed out that any commercial development proposed in the future would require environmental review, and also would require providing adequate parking on-site, not to include on-street parking.

Chrm. Nesbitt noted his agreement with existing traffic and parking problems.

Roger Waltman, Hidden Creek resident, stated concerns with a dirt road that accesses Nevada Street from Blocker Drive, and that drivers are using it to avoid the 4-way stop sign at the intersection of Blocker and Nevada Street. He also felt the 4-way stop sign could not handle increased traffic.

Comm. Hale inquired of staff when upgrading of this intersection was planned. Public Works Director Fossum indicated that a signal to re-

place the 4-way stop had been designed and funding was currently being investigated.

Director Wong added that the improvements planned for the rail station would include a parking lot for Amtrak customers, and parking additional to this was being investigated as a need for more parking has become apparent with the unexpected popularity of the rail station.

Michael Reilly returned to state that Blocker Drive is the only access to the Hidden Creek subdivision and with commercial deliveries to possible new businesses with this zoning change, plus the existing railroad track across Blocker, there could be a dangerous backlog of traffic occurring. At the request of Comm. McCord, he stated he would like to eliminate repair shops from the list of permitted uses.

Michael Murphy, architect for the applicant, stated that the proposal was to create a mixed-use space with a 200-foot buffer of office space. They would propose a project that would be desirable to everyone concerned, including the residents of the neighboring subdivision.

Comm. McCord suggested excluding the permitted uses that seemed to be a concern to previous speakers, i.e. repair shops for radios, electronics, television sets, etc., and the repair and sales of light mechanical equipment and supplies. Murphy then stated his feeling, that the general area of Nevada Street originally consisted of industrial development, but the need for office space had surpassed the need for light industrial and it had been driven out of the area. He believed the need for businesses such as light repair, with proper screening and fencing provisions, could be located in the area and co-exist with the nearby residential subdivision. He also pointed out that the applicants owned a business in the area and that one of the applicant's lives in the nearby Hidden Creek subdivision. He felt the list of permitted uses as proposed, in conjunction with the 200-foot buffer of office space, had been distilled down to meet the needs of everyone involved.

Dennis Meyer, 255 Hidden Creek Drive and one of the applicants, stated he has no objection to eliminating repair facilities from the list of permitted uses. He understands the parking concerns and stated that the area near the actual Hidden Creek will be avoided, and that only a small part of the creek is located on the property in question.

Ruby Nogoy returned to reiterate her traffic concerns.

The public hearing was closed.

Comm. Hale stated that as a member of the Traffic Committee, it was her understanding that with the train station improvements to be completed soon, the train would not block Blocker Drive and Director Fossum assured her that this was true. She noted that the entire area is currently in a state of flux and she felt that the existing parking problems should be alleviated with the improvements planned. She found the statements of Murphy and Meyer reassuring, and she also felt that the 200-foot buffer of office buildings should improve the view along Blocker Drive while still accommodating the need for light industrial construction.

Comm. Manning agreed with the rezone request as presented, and pointed out that any future proposal for specific construction would have to come before the Planning Commission for approval and concerns could be addressed at that time.

Director Wong added that any proposed development would also require environmental review at that time.

Comm. Manning **MOVED** to recommend that City Council adopt the Negative Declaration prepared for Blocker Rezone – 11025 Blocker Drive.

Comm. Hale **SECONDED**.

AYES:	Hale, Manning, McCord, Chrm. Nesbitt
NOES:	Smith
ABSTAIN	None
ABSENT:	None

The motion was approved.

Comm. Manning **MOVED** to recommend that the City Council approve General Plan Amendment for 11025 Blocker Drive, changing the land use designation from Urban Low Density Residential (ULDR) to Commercial/Industrial (COMM/IND);

Comm. Hale **SECONDED**.

AYES: Hale, Manning, McCord, Chrm. Nesbitt
NOES: Smith
ABSTAIN None
ABSENT: None

The motion was approved.

Comm. Manning **MOVED** to recommend that the City Council find that the proposed Rezone for 11025 Blocker Drive is:

1. Consistent with the General Plan; and
2. Consistent with the public interest, health, safety, and welfare of the City.

Comm. Hale **SECONDED**.

AYES: Hale, Manning, McCord, Chrm. Nesbitt
NOES: Smith
ABSTAIN None
ABSENT: None

The motion was approved.

Comm. Manning **MOVED** to recommend that the City Council approve Rezone for 11025 Blocker Drive, changing the zoning designation from Single-family residential (R-1-10) to Neighborhood Commercial and Light Manufacturing (C-1/M-L).

Comm. Hale **SECONDED**.

AYES: Hale, Manning, McCord, Chrm. Nesbitt
NOES: Smith
ABSTAIN None
ABSENT: None

The motion was approved.

Comm. Manning **MOVED** to recommend that the City Council approve the Development Agreement for 11025 Blocker Drive (Exhibit D) with the following amendment: That staff address parking on Blocker Drive and the type of vehicles that can be used in future development.

Comm. Hale **SECONDED.**

Chrm. Nesbitt **MOVED** to amend the motion to exclude under Exhibit B, Item C.- Permitted Uses, Item No. 24:

24. ~~Repair shops for shoes, radios, electronics, television sets, and domestic appliances.~~

and to exclude under Exhibit B, Item D.- Permitted Uses – Light Industrial, No. 5:

5. ~~Repair (minor) and sales of light mechanical equipment and supplies (excluding paint booths or painting activities).~~

Comm. Manning **SECONDED.**

The vote on the amendment:

AYES:	Hale, Manning, McCord, Chrm. Nesbitt
NOES:	Smith
ABSTAIN	None
ABSENT:	None

The motion was approved.

The vote on the main motion as amended:

AYES:	Hale, Manning, McCord, Chrm. Nesbitt
NOES:	Smith
ABSTAIN	None
ABSENT:	None

The motion was approved.

The Chairman announced the 10-day appeal period.

B. Civic Design and Variance – 500 Auburn Folsom Road (Park Hill Office II) – File #s CD 02-5; VA 03-1. – The applicant requests approval of a Civic Design to construct a 16,260 square foot two-story office building (Park Hill Office II) at 500 Auburn Folsom Road. The request also includes a Variance to allow the office building to encroach within the front setback.

Reg Murray gave the staff report. He described the project, the second phase of the Park Hill office complex that includes a proposed Variance to reduce the front setback requirement for the office building. He gave details on access, parking, and landscaping planned, and noted the efforts being made by the applicant to save trees. He pointed out a staff recommendation regarding trees: As the amount of parking planned is significantly above the City standard, staff suggested that several trees with a rating of "5" could be saved if 5-7 parking spaces were eliminated. This would provide an immediate landscape presence on the property and still exceed parking requirements. He noted that the Auburn Recreation District park is immediately adjacent to the west of this project. A provision is included that would give the applicant the opportunity to put signage at the southern driveway to identify that this parking is intended for the tenants and customers of the facility and not for the park. He also reviewed the variance proposed.

There was discussion of the parking along Auburn Folsom Road that would be eliminated with the road striping changes. Planner Murray explained how the widening of the lanes would affect current parking along Auburn Folsom Road, he noted that the bike lane would remain but the width needed for vehicle parking would be eliminated. There was concern that vehicles would park there anyway, creating a hazard, and this would have to be enforced.

The public hearing was opened.

Michael Murphy, project architect, gave further details, explaining that this is, in fact, the third and final phase of this project. He noted that the extra large parking area planned is intended for the entire complex. He advised that they recognize the importance of trees and they have tried to retain the larger oaks on the parcel and they will also be mitigating trees. For this reason, he asked that the parking spaces that staff would like to eliminate be allowed to remain. He also would like the condition addressing retaining walls to allow the use of exterior plaster to match the building. He noted that they would like to screen the ground-mounted A/C units with landscaping in lieu of a wall. He addressed parking, stating that currently the public parks in the lots during off-hours and on weekends and this is acceptable to the owner.

The Commissioners discussed the staff request that the number of parking spaces be reduced to save trees.

Janice Forbes, applicant, acknowledged the value of trees and reiterated that they are quite willing to save all the trees possible and to mitigate any that have to be removed. She advised that the parking provided for the first two Park Hill phases proved to be inadequate, and the extra parking being requested for this project is needed to improve parking for the entire complex. She also questioned fees paid on the first two phases of this complex. Director Fossum responded, stating that the project will be reviewed for fees due with submittal of building plans.

The public hearing was closed.

Comm. Hale questioned the width of the traffic lanes on Auburn Folsom Road, inquiring if the lanes could be narrowed to reduce speed and thus possibly allow for parking on the shoulder.

Director Fossum responded, explaining that turn lanes were necessary for this project and that would not allow for shoulder width adequate for parking.

Comm. McCord **MOVED** to amend Condition 4.d. to read:

4.d. "Prior to issuance of permits (e.g. grading, building), the applicant shall provide a ~~new~~ **revised** arborist report....."

Comm. Smith **SECONDED**.

AYES:	Hale, Manning, McCord, Smith, Chrm. Nesbitt
NOES:	None
ABSTAIN	None
ABSENT:	None

The motion was approved.

Comm. Manning **MOVED** to amend Condition 4.e.to read:

4.e. ~~"Parking stalls 35-42 shall be eliminated.~~ **Retain parking spaces 35-42 and apply a mitigation standard of 1" replacement for each 2" of removal for the protected trees in those eight spaces.**

and to add Condition 5.c. to read:

5.c. Oak trees eliminated by parking spaces 35-42 shall be mitigated by replanting at a ratio of 1" replacement per 2" removed. These additional oak trees shall be provided in addition to the minimum number of landscape trees required by code.

Comm. Hale **SECONDED**.

AYES: Hale, Manning, McCord, Smith
NOES: Chrm. Nesbitt
ABSTAIN None
ABSENT: None

The motion was approved.

Comm. Manning **MOVED** to amend Condition 6.b. to read:

6.b. "The ground mounted A/C units on the north and south sides of the building shall be screened from public view by screen walls constructed with materials and colors to match the main building **or appropriate landscaping**".

Comm. Hale **SECONDED**.

AYES: Hale, Manning, McCord, Smith, Chrm. Nesbitt
NOES: None
ABSTAIN None
ABSENT: None

The motion was approved.

Comm. Hale **MOVED** to amend Condition 8. to read:

8. "...All retaining walls in locations generally visible to the public shall be constructed using decorative block (i.e. split face block **or exterior plaster to match the building**).

Comm. McCord **SECONDED**.

AYES: Hale, Manning, McCord, Smith, Chrm. Nesbitt
NOES: None
ABSTAIN None
ABSENT: None

The motion was approved.

Comm. Manning **MOVED** to have staff review Conditions 41 and 42 for applicability.

Comm. Smith **SECONDED**.

AYES: Hale, Manning, McCord, Smith, Chrm. Nesbitt
NOES: None
ABSTAIN None
ABSENT: None

The motion was approved.

Comm. McCord **MOVED** to adopt the Negative Declaration prepared for Park Hill Office Phase II – 500 Auburn Folsom Road.

Comm. Smith **SECONDED** .

AYES: Hale, Manning, McCord, Smith, Chrm. Nesbitt
NOES: None
ABSTAIN None
ABSENT: None

The motion was approved.

Comm. McCord **MOVED** to approve the Civic Design for Park Hill Office II – 500 Auburn Folsom Road – subject to the conditions listed in Exhibit A of the staff report and as amended by the Planning Commission.

Chrm. Smith **SECONDED**.

AYES: Hale, Manning, McCord, Smith, Chrm. Nesbitt
NOES: None
ABSTAIN None
ABSENT: None

The motion was approved.

Comm. Hale **MOVED** to adopt the following Findings of fact for the Variance for Park Hill Office II – 500 Auburn Folsom Road:

1. That the granting of the variance is not inconsistent with the limitations upon other properties in the vicinity and the OB zone district in which the subject property is situated.
2. That because of special circumstances applicable to the subject property, including size, shape, topography, location, or surroundings, the strict application of the provisions of this chapter is found to deprive the subject property of privileges enjoyed by other properties in the vicinity in the same zone district.

Comm. Manning **SECONDED**.

AYES: Hale, Manning, McCord, Smith, Chrm. Nesbitt
NOES: None
ABSTAIN None
ABSENT: None

The motion was approved.

Comm. Hale **MOVED** to approve the Variance for Park Hill Office II – 500 Auburn Folsom Road.

Comm. Manning **SECONDED**.

AYES: Hale, Manning, McCord, Smith, Chrm. Nesbitt
NOES: None
ABSTAIN None
ABSENT: None

The motion was approved.

The Chairman announced the 10-day appeal period.

ITEM VI:

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT FOLLOW-UP REPORTS

A. City Council Meetings

Future City Council meetings were discussed. Comm. Smith would like future discussion with City Council on the allowable height of commercial buildings in the City, where there are no zoning height requirements.

B. Future Planning Commission Meetings

C. Reports

- i. Presentation Regarding Street Trees by Public Works Department and Community Development Department

Director Wong explained that as the City's current street standard does not include street trees, before they can be required for new development amendments to both the General Plan and the Zoning Ordinance would be required. Director Fossum further described the possible methods of financing the installation in existing areas, and also for the maintenance of the trees once they are installed. The Commission discussed the possibility of street trees in Auburn. Staff will obtain additional information from the City Attorney and this item will be brought back at a future Planning Commission meeting.

ITEM VII: PLANNING COMMISSION REPORTS

Comm. Smith reported on a recent Fire Safe Council meeting.

ITEM VIII: FUTURE PLANNING COMMISSION AGENDA ITEMS

None.

ITEM IX: ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 9:28 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Janet Elaine Ferro, Administrative Assistant

Planning Commission
February 18, 2003